

Appln. No. 10/779,388  
Amendment dated November 11, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 11, 2005

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 10 remain in this application. No claims have been cancelled or withdrawn. Claims 11 through 18 have been added.

**Paragraphs 1 through 3 of the Office Action**

Claims 1 through 3, 5, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johanson in view of Hu.

Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johanson in view of Hu, and further in view of Griffith.

Claim 8 has have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johanson in view of Hu, and further in view of Griffith, and further in view of Isomura.

Claim 1 requires, in part, "a printer positioned in said main housing and operationally coupled to said central processor for printing out said written message". It is conceded in the Office Action that the Johanson patent does not disclose this requirement of the claims, and it is then asserted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the printer of Hu with the apparatus of the Johanson patent.

However, while the Johanson patent discusses a voice to text conversion module for converting the voice signals, the Hu patent describes an invention that lacks any voice capture or recording capability (such as an answering machine), and instead discusses the printing of text on the display screen on paper. The text on the message screen consists solely of information about the characteristics of a call, or information transferred from another PBX unit, and lacks any mention of using the printer to

Appln. No. 10/779,388  
Amendment dated November 11, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 11, 2005

transcribe any information carried in the form of voice over the phone. In particular, see Hu at col. 2, line 65 through col. 3, line 19 (emphasis added):

The telephone station 10 includes an LCD display 22 for providing message and status information to the user. In the present embodiment, the display is a four row, 30-character alphanumeric liquid crystal display. The display is employed to display such information as calling/called number and name, call waiting number and name, clock/calendar, dialed number and call duration. Significantly, for the present invention, the display is also used to display messages from another station or from a message center associated with the PBX system.

A printer unit 24 is provided with the telephone station 10 and includes a simple printer mechanism such as a dot matrix printer to enable information from the display 22 as well as outside message information to be printed so as to provide a hard copy to the station user. In the preferred embodiment, the printer has the capability of printing the same number of characters per line (i.e., thirty) as can be displayed on the display 22. The printing is accomplished on standard printing paper 26. It will be appreciated that many different types of printer mechanisms could be employed, with a simple dot matrix printer similar to those employed with portable calculators and the like currently being preferred.

It should be clear from the above that there is no suggestion that the Hu apparatus captures any voice messages, either in audible or textual form, and is simply directed to displaying and printing the various call characteristics that are available on a PBX, as well as any PBX supplied messages. It is therefore submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art, considering the invention disclosed in the Hu patent, would not be motivated to combine its printout capability for call characteristics to the voice to text function of the Johanson patent.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Johanson, Hu, Griffith, and Isomura set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 1. Further, claims 2 through 3 and 5 through 9, which depend from claim 1, also include the

Appln. No. 10/779,388  
Amendment dated November 11, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 11, 2005

requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 3 and 5 through 9 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Paragraph 4 of the Office Action**

Claim 10 has been allowed.

**Paragraph 5 of the Office Action**

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action states that claim 4 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claims 1 and 4 (in their original form) into the recitation of added claim 11, and therefore claim 11 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 12 through 18, by virtue of their dependency from added claim 11, are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
Customer No. 40,158  
P.O. Box 5027  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027  
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357

Date:

Nov. 11, 2005